

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING D	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,277	01/16/2	002	Hisakazu Hojo	020048	2379
23850	7590	02/18/2004		EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP				PRATT, HELEN F	
1725 K STR SUITE 1000				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
001121111	ON, DC 2000	06		1761	

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Anti-u Community	10/046,277	HOJO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAIL INC DATE CHI	Helen F. Pratt	1761
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		•
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original transfer and the correction is objected to by the Examiner.	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/046,277

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 8-10 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper dated 1-9-04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemp et al. (6,572,908) or Buddemeyer et al. (6,248,376).

Kemp et al. disclose a composition containing a polyvalent metal such as a metal hydroxide, oxide, carbonate or bicarbonate, such calcium hydroxide, a phosphoric acid and an organic acid such as succinic acid which can be used as a food additive (abstract and col. 10, lines 5-16). Claims 1–3, 7 and 11 differ from the reference in the use of an alkali metal and in the particular amount of alkali metal and in the amount of alkali metal and in the electrical conductivity as in steps 1a and b. However, it is seen that the alkali metal can also be sodium or potassium hydroxide (page 12, last 3 lines). The reference discloses that a monovalent or divalent metal base can be used (col. 9,

Application/Control Number: 10/046,277

Art Unit: 1761

lines 25-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to substitute the polyvalent metal for a monovalent metal or it would have been obvious to use the polyvalent metal since the reference discloses that they are equivalent. The particular amount of alkali metal is seen to have been within the skill of the ordinary worker to vary as the composition is shown. Also, the electrical conductivity is seen to have been shown as the composition is known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use particular amounts of alkali metal and a particular electrical conductivity as the composition has been shown.

Buddemeyer et al. disclose that it is known to make a calcium enriched composition using a composition containing phosphate ions, citrate ions, calcium ions, and a metal hydroxide and water in food products as in claims 1-3 (abstract). Claims 1-3 differ from the references in the amount of alkali metal and in the particular electric conductivity. However, Buddemeyer et al. disclose a composition containing 7.16% alkali metal, which is seen to have been within the claimed amount (col. 15, lines 10-20). As the composition has been shown, it is seen that the electrical conductivity has been shown. Therefore, it would have been obvious to make the composition as claimed as shown by Buddemeyer et al.

Claim 4 further requires that the phosphoric compound can be calcium phosphate. Such is disclosed by Kemp et al. as the phosphoric acid would have reacted with the calcium succinate (col. 10, lines 5-16). The same is true in Buddemeyer et al. (col. 14, lines 14-50). Claim 4 is also a product by process claim. The fact that the procedures of the reference are different than that of applicant is not a sufficient reason for allowing the product-by-process claims since the patentability of

Application/Control Number: 10/046,277

Art Unit: 1761

such claims is based upon the product formed and not the method by which it was produced. See In re Thorpe 227 USPQ 964. The burden is upon applicant to submit objective evidence to support their position as to the product-by-process claims. See Ex parte Jungfer 18 USPQ 2D 1796. Therefore, it would have been obvious to make a composition containing calcium phosphate.

Claim 6 further requires that the composition is a particular size.

However, nothing is seen at this time that the diameter of the compositions of the above references are not of the claimed size. Therefore, it would have been obvious to add an additive to the composition of the claimed size.

Claims 5 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above combined references as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11 above, and further in view of Ndife et al. (5,489,440).

Claim 5 further requires an emulsification stabilizer in particular amounts and claim 12 a composition containing an emulsification stabilizer. Ndife et al. disclose an oral rehydration solution containing minerals and a stabilizer (col. 10, lines 1-10). Nothing is seen that the stabilizer would not be an emulsifying stabilizer. Even though the mineral compositions of the references are not the same compositions as that of the claims, minerals are shown by the reference to need a stabilizer (col. 6, lines 58-70, col. 7, lines 1-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to add a stabilizer for minerals.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen F. Pratt whose telephone number is 703-308-1978. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

Art Unit: 1761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Milton Cano, can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hp 2-10-04

HELEN PRATT